



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,119	02/06/2004	Albert S. Deutsch	PISCES 00.01 CIP DIV	8413
27667	7590	02/09/2006	EXAMINER	
HAYES, SOLOWAY P.C. 3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140 TUCSON, AZ 85718				ZIMMERMAN, JOSHUA D
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/774,119	DEUTSCH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joshua D. Zimmerman	2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-13,16,19,20,22,29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 9-13,16,19,20,22,29 and 30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachments(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0001, 3/31/05, 5/06/05, 11/18/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 22 is objected to as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what applicant means by "an amide of a carboxylic."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,187,380 Hallman et al.

1. Regarding claim 16, Hallman et al. teach "a method of imaging a lithographic printing plate having a coating comprising one or more monomers and a photoinitiator, comprising the steps of:

applying imagewise a co-synergist for initiating a polymerization reaction in a subsequent heat treatment step; and

heating said coating (Column 10, line 59 – column 11, line 6, and example 14.

Examiner notes that Hallman et al. disclose heating in order to harden the image, thus the reactants are polymerized by heat).

Regarding claim 19, Hallman et al. teach "a process for preparing for press a printing plate having a coating comprising one ore more epoxy resins (Column 11, lines 1-6), comprising the step of:

applying imagewise to said coating, a water-based solution comprising an amine" (example 14. The development of the example includes a water based amine solution).

Regarding claim 20, Hallman et al. teach "a computer to plate system, comprising: (a) a print head containing a plurality of ink jet nozzles such that the print head is capable of jetting imagewise a solution, (figure 1 and column 10, lines 50-51) (b) a printing plate having a coated surface comprising photosensitive compounds capable of being insolubilized by the solution, (c) a heater capable of heating the printing plate, and (c) a developer capable of dissolving the non-imaged coating" (column 11 lines 1-6, examples 1-3. See also example 14 and column 6, line 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 9-13, 22, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallman et al. (US 6,187,380) in view of DeBoer et al. (US 6,044,762).

Regarding claim 9, Hallman et al. teach a method of “develop(ing) a lithographic printing plate having a subtractive coating, comprising the step of: a) imagewise applying an insolubilizing chemical to said coating” (column 6, lines 50-53) and “wherein said insolubilizing chemical undergoes a chemical reaction with, or facilitates a chemical reaction in said subtractive coating on said plate, making the reaction coating insoluble to a developing solution in said working fluids in which the unreacted coating is soluble (example 14).” Hallman et al. lack the “method of using a printing press employing working fluids in normal operation” which comprises “b) mounting said plate on said printing press; and c) operating said printing press such that the unimaged areas of the coating are dissolved in the working fluids.” DeBoer et al. teach an on-press system which uses said “working fluids in normal operation ... such that the unimaged areas of the coating are dissolved in the working fluids” (column 5, lines 17-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system and process of Hallman et al. with the on-press developing system of DeBoer et al. so as to quickly and efficiently prepare the printing plate for printing.

Regarding claim 10, Hallman et al. further teach “wherein said coating comprises an acrylate monomer (column 6, lines 11-22).”

Regarding claim 11, Hallman et al. further teach “wherein said coating also comprises a photoinitiator (column 4, lines 53-63).”

Regarding claim 12, Hallman et al. further teach "wherein the insolubilizing chemical as at least one amine functional group (column 6, lines 5-10)."

Regarding claim 13, Hallman et al. further teach "wherein the insolubilizing chemical is selected from the group consisting of: an amino salt, an amine, and a base (column 6, lines 5-10)."

Regarding claim 29, Hallman et al. teach a computer-to-plate system comprising an "ink jet printhead containing an insolubilizing fluid" and a "printing plate with a subtractive coating that is chemically reactive with said insolubilizing fluid (figure 1 and column 11, lines 1-6 and example 14). Hallman et al. lack integrating said computer-to-plate system into a printing press for a "computer-to-press system." DeBoer et al. teach "a computer-to-press system, comprising: a) a printing press" and "an on-press developable printing plate." It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system and process of Hallman et al. with the on-press developing system of DeBoer et al. so as to quickly and efficiently prepare a printing plate for printing.

Regarding claim 30, Hallman et al. further teach "wherein said insolubilizing fluid comprises an amine" (column 6, lines 5-10).

3. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallman et al. in view of Busman et al. (US 5,763,134). Hallman et al. teach "a computer to plate system." Hallman et al. lack "wherein said coating contains one ore more sulfonic acid esters or amides of a carboxylic or acid." Busman et al. teach that the use of "sulfonic acid esters" as photochemical progenitors for coatings on printing plates are well known

in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Hallman et al. with the coating of Busman et al. because of the wide usage of said coating in the art, allowing for an economical and readily available coating. It should also be noted that applicant admits the use of "sulfonic acid esters" and "amides" in photosensitive compositions used in positive lithographic plates is well known (page 2, lines 21-22).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 1 that Hallman et al. do not teach a heating step, applicant is referred to column 6, line 36, or example 14.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 1 that Hallman et al. do not teach a water-based solution, again, applicant is referred to example 14.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 2 that Hallman et al. do not teach an imaging method, applicant is referred to column 4, lines 5-7, and again, to example 14.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 2 that DeBoer et al. (US 6,044,762) do not teach the necessary on-press developability, applicant is referred to column 5, lines 17-26, specifically lines 24-26.

Applicant's arguments on page 2 regarding the rejection of claim 22 are moot because claim 20 stands rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-272-2749. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8:30A - 6:00P, Alternate Fridays 8:30A-5:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joshua D Zimmerman
Examiner
Art Unit 2854

jdz



ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800